

REMARKS

Claims 24, 26, 28-31, 33-39, and 41-46 are pending in the present application. Claims 24, 28-30, and 36-38 are amended. Claims 24, 28, and 36 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejection in view of the following Remarks.

Substance of Interview on September 22, 2009

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Yu Gu for taking the time to discuss the present application with Applicant's representative, Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305), during the personal interview held on September 22, 2009.

Claim Discussed: Independent claims 24, 28, and 36.

Prior Art Discussed: Wallentin et al. (US 6,292,667).

General Results: No agreement was reached with respect to the claims then pending. However, the Examiner did explain how he is interpreting Wallentin to teach the claimed "determining whether a signal connection exists." Specifically, the Examiner explained that Wallentin's mobile switching center (MSC) inherently establishes some sort of "signal connection" with the mobile station in order to receive location update messages from the mobile station. Thus, the Examiner interprets Wallentin's RNC1 as implicitly determining that such "signal connection" had previously been established since it is notified of the mobile station's location (multicell area) by the MSC. The Examiner suggested amending the independent claims to further distinguish the claimed "determining" over this interpretation of Wallentin.

Specification

The specification has been amended to correct various typographical errors. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the specification do not add any new matter to the present application.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 24, 26, 28, and 36 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallentin. Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37-39, and 41-46 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallentin in view of to Ahmavaara et al. (US 6,792,278). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claims 24, 28, and 36 now explicitly recite that a first controller in the radio network controller (RNC) determines whether an active signal connection currently exists between the mobile communication terminal and the radio access network or the core network, in order to judge the transmission destination of the paging message.

In the rejection, the Examiner cites to col. 11, lines 26-56 in Wallentin as teaching “checking paging table 100 to determine the transmission destination, thereby judging whether a signal connection exists” (see Office Action at page 4). In Wallentin, the visiting location register (part of the core network) determines in which multicell area the mobile station was last located, and then the MSC (also part of the core network) transmits the paging message to the RNC which serves as the paging control node of that multicell area (col. 11, lines 17-24). Thereafter, the RNC relays the paging message to all of the base stations for the cells in the multicell area which the RNC controls (col. 11, lines 39-42). The RNC simply consults the paging table in order to identify such cells (col. 11, lines 27-39), not to determine whether the mobile station currently has an active signal connection.

As discussed in the Substance of Interview section above, the Examiner takes the position that Wallentin’s RNC would be able to infer that some sort of signal connection had previously existed between the mobile station and MSC, since the MSC has information on the mobile station’s location. However, even assuming *arguendo* that Wallentin’s RNC were to make such inference, this is not the same as determining whether an active signal connection currently exists for the mobile station. Wallentin does not provide any teaching or suggestion of an RNC

determining whether an active signal connection currently exists between the mobile communication terminal and the radio access network or the core network, in order to judge the transmission destination of the paging message, as presently claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Wallentin and Ahmavaara, when taken separately or in obvious connection, fail to teach or suggest every claimed feature recited in independent claims 24, 28, and 36. Accordingly, claims 24, 28, and 36 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 26, 29-31, 33-35, 37-39, and 41-46 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under §§ 102(b) and 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Application No. 10/562,676
Amendment dated October 16, 2009
After Final Office Action of July 16, 2009

Docket No.: 2611-0251PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  #47,305

for D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatchouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 265-8000

Attorney for Applicant